Claims 1-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Independent claim 1, 2, and 13 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as originally filed at paragraph [0013] New claims 23, 24, and 25 are added. Support for the additions can be found in the originally filed specification at claims 1, 2, and 15, and at paragraph [0013]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) in view of Shostak (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,083). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Rigsby et al. are generally directed toward computer implemented speech recognition system training. In particular, the Examiner relies on Rigsby et al. to teach creating voice bindings to menu and submenu items that are co-displayed. However, Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate that a user must navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of a multilevel menu to reach a particular menu item of interest before voice training can be conducted.

The teachings of Shostak are generally directed toward voice controlled wireless communication. In particular, the Examiner relies on Shostak to teach using speech recognition to attempt to dial phone numbers in a buddy list and, in the event of ambiguity, audibly reproducing the names for the user to select one of the names. However, Rigsby et al. and Shostak do not teach, suggest, or motivate that a user must

navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of a multilevel menu to reach a particular menu item of interest before voice training can be conducted.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system that, that a user must navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of a multilevel menu to reach a particular menu item of interest before voice training can be conducted. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a path sequence by which a first location within a multilevel menu would be reached by user navigation to said first location during a voice binding training mode via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product performed by a user in order to navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of the multilevel menu in order to reach a particular item of interest at the first location; upon arrival at said first location, obtaining a first utterance of speech comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product." Independent claims 2 and 15, especially as amended, recite similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0013]. Therefore, Rigsby et al. and Shostak do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom. Applicants further note that new claims 23-25 recite similar subject matter and should be allowed for the same reasons.

Claims 10-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) in view of Shostak (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,083 and De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873.064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of significant differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the teachings of Rigsby et al. and Shostak, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claims 2 and 15.

The teachings of De Armas et al. are generally directed toward a multi-action voice macro method. In particular, the Examiner relies on De Armas et al. to teach matching a phrase decoded from a user utterance to a vocabulary phrase of a sub-context tree generated by automated analysis of a menu structure. However, Rigsby et al., Shostak, and De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate that a user must navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of a multilevel menu to reach a particular menu item of interest before voice training can be conducted.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system in which a user must navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of a multilevel menu to reach a particular menu item of interest before voice training can be conducted. For example, independent claim 2, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence through said multilevel menu structure to a first location within said multilevel menu in response to user navigation through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of the multilevel menu in order to reach a particular item of interest at said first location during a voice binding training

mode via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product; upon arrival at said first location, obtaining a first utterance of speech comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product." Independent claim 15, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0013]. Therefore, Rigsby et al., Shostak, and DeArmas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 10-14 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of their dependence from allowable base claims. Applicants further note that new claims 23-25 recite similar subject matter and should be allowed for the same reasons.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 16, 2007

E-Signature: /Gregory A. Stobbs/
By: Gregory A. Stobbs
    Reg. No. 28,764
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600